

REMARKS

As a preliminary, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank the Examiner for the personal interview which was held on June 29, 2005.

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to replace "polarizer" by "polarizing film," and dependent claims 32-34 have been amended accordingly.

Support for the amendment is found throughout the original application, in particular on page 7, lines 7-8 of the specification. Further, it is submitted that the amendment does not affect the scope of the claim.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-12, 16-20, and 28-34 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to an optical film. Independent claims 13-15, and 21-27 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a liquid crystal display.

In the Office Action, the following rejections are set forth:

- Claims 1-7, 11, 13-15, 18-20, 22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 2004/0180149 to Shibue et al. ("Shibue") in view of JP 6-59123 ("Yoshimi");
- Claims 8-10, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shibue and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,498,633 to Ozeki et al. ("Ozeki");
- Claims 12, 16, 21, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shibue and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,088,079 to Kameyama et al. ("Kameyama");
- Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shibue and Yoshimi, further in view of JP 8-271934 to Tanaka ("Tanaka");

- Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shibue and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,654,085 to Koike (“Koike”);
- Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shibue and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,094,245 to Ochi et al. (“Ochi”).

It is alleged in the Office Action that the construction shown on Fig. 1 of Shibue includes “a polarizer, wherein first portion 21/23 and the second portion 22/24 are laminated by an adhesive 110/120” (Office Action at page 2, last two lines).

The rejections are respectfully traversed. The description of Shibue corresponding to Fig. 1 states at page 12, paragraph [0169]:

Numeral 31 is a first polarizing plate and numeral 32 is a second polarizing plate. First polarizing plate 31 comprises first film 21, second film 22, and first polarizer 110. Second polarizing plate 32 comprises third film 23, fourth film 24, and second polarizer 120. In this example, second film 22 as well as third film 23 is the film for a liquid crystal display of the present invention, and first film 21 as well as fourth film 24 is a protective film for a polarizing plate, which is prepared employing triacetyl cellulose (TAC).

Thus, films 21-24 are not polarizers, as alleged by the Examiner, but films 21 and 24 are conventional protective films and films 22 and 23 are the invention films of Shibue, i.e., retardation films. Further, films 110 and 120 are the polarizers of Shibue, and not adhesive layers as alleged by the Examiner. Polarizers 110 and 120 are disposed on opposite sides of the liquid crystal cell 4 in the conventional manner.

In summary, in the construction of Fig. 1 of Shibue, each polarizing plate of Shibue has a single polarizing film 110, 120. Thus, in particular, Shibue does not remedy the deficiencies of Yoshimi, which also shows a single polarizer on each side of the liquid crystal cell, as explained in

response to the previous rejections. Specifically, Shibue does not show a polarizing plate comprising a polarizing film comprising laminated first and second portions as recited in present claim 1, let alone a liquid crystal display device comprising on at least one side of a liquid crystal cell a polarizing plate comprising a polarizer comprising laminated first and second portions as recited in claims 13, 14 and 15. Further, the other references also fail to remedy this deficiency. Therefore, claims 1, 13, 14, and 15, and the claims dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are not obvious over the cited combinations of references.

In addition, with respect to the dependent claims, the combinations of features recited in these respective claims are not taught or suggested in the cited references taken alone or in any combination. Therefore, for these respective reasons alone, the dependent claims are not obvious over the cited combinations of references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020582

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep